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#### Abstract

In this note it is shown how an integer $x$ can be represented uniquely in a noninteger basis provided the "digits" of the representation are allowed to be nonintegers. It is then shown that the integer parts of these "digits" contain all the information necessary to recover $x$.


Let $\beta$ be an integer greater than one and let $x_{0}$ be a nonnegative integer. Then $x_{0}$ has a unique base $-\beta$ representation of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{0}=d_{0}+d_{1} \beta+d_{2} \beta^{2}+\cdots+d_{n} \beta^{n} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the digits $d_{i}$ are integers satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq d_{i}<\beta \quad(i=0,1, \ldots, n) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

When we relax the restriction that $\beta$ be an integer and allow it to be a real number greater than one, we must also relax the restriction that the $d_{i}$ be integers, in which case $x_{0}$ can be represented in infinitely many different ways in the form (1) where the digits satisfy (2). To obtain a unique representation, we must impose additional conditions. Perhaps the most natural is to demand that in addition to (2) the quantities $x_{i}$ defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{n}=d_{n} \\
& x_{i}=d_{i}+\beta x_{i+1} \quad(i=n-1, n-2, \ldots, 0) \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

all be integers. In this case $d_{0}$ will be the unique nonnegative number less than $\beta$ such that $x_{0}-d_{0}$ is an integral multiple of $\beta$, and $x_{1}$ will then be $\left(x_{0}-d_{0}\right) / \beta$. In general $d_{\imath}$ will be the unique nonnegative number less than $\beta$ such that $x_{i}-d_{i}$ is an integral multiple of $\beta$, and $x_{i+1}$ will then be $\left(x_{i}-d_{i}\right) / \beta$. The naturalness comes from the fact that these statements characterize the integers $d_{i}$ when $\beta$ is an integer.*

As we noted above, when $\beta$ is not an integer, the $d_{i}$ in the expansion (1) are digits by courtesy only, since they are not integers. In fact they may be nonterminating decimals. Curiously enough, only the integer parts of the $d_{i}$ are needed to determine $x_{0}$. Specifically, let

$$
d_{i}^{\prime}=\left\lfloor d_{i}\right\rfloor
$$

[^0]Then the sequence $x_{0}, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ is uniquely determined by the sequence $d_{0}^{\prime}$, $d_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, d_{n}^{\prime}$.

To see this, first note that the requirement that $x_{n}$ be an integer implies that $d_{n}=d_{n}^{\prime}$. Now suppose that we have determined $x_{i+1}$, and set

$$
x_{i}^{\prime}=d_{i}^{\prime}+\beta x_{i+1}
$$

Then $x_{i}-x_{i}^{\prime}=d_{i}-d_{i}^{\prime}<1$. Since $x_{i} \geq x_{i}^{\prime}$, it follows that $x_{i}=\left\lceil x_{i}^{\prime}\right\rceil$.
There are two comments to be made about this result. First, if $\beta$ were an integer with $2^{t}<\beta \leq 2^{t+1}$, then the digits of a base- $\beta$ representation of a number would require $t+1$ bits for their binary representations. We have shown that for noninteger bases we can define integer digits $d_{i}^{\prime}$ representable by the same number of bits. Moreover, the integer $x_{0}$ can be evaluated by the recursion

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{n} & =d_{n}^{\prime} \\
x_{i} & =\left\lceil d_{i}^{\prime}+\beta x_{i+1}\right\rceil \quad(i=n-1, n-2, \ldots, 0),
\end{aligned}
$$

which reduces to (3) when $\beta$ is an integer.
The second comment concerns subbinary representation, where $1<\beta<2$. Here the digits $d_{i}^{\prime}$ are zeros or ones, and each zero digit causes the current $x_{i}$ to increase by at least one. As $\beta$ approaches one, the proportion of zero digits increases, until the representation reduces to a one followed by $x_{0}-1$ zeros, which may properly be called a base-one representation of $x_{0}$.
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    *The referee has provided an equivalent characterization beginning " $d_{0}$ is the distance from $x_{0}$ to the largest multiple of $\beta$ not greater than $x_{0}$, and $x_{1}$ is that multiple." Some may find this more natural.

